



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/081,226

02/22/2002

Russell D. Slifer

106.002US01

1661

21186

7590

02/21/2006

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH
1600 TCF TOWER
121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

LE, DEBBIE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2168

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/081,226

Applicant(s)

SLIFER, RUSSELL D.

Examiner

DEBBIE M. LE

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/0/05. Claims 1-8 are pending for examinations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grainger et al (USP Application No. 2002/0065677 A1) in view of Snyder (USP Application 2002/0111953 A1).

As per claim 1, Grainger discloses in a patent application manager system maintaining a database of references, a method comprising:

entering reference data in a database for a first patent application (as first case, ¶ 0008, Fig. 13C, # 1315, ¶ 0038);

copying the reference data to a database for a second patent application (as second case, ¶ 0008), where the second patent application is related to the first patent application (as the second case to be associated with the first case, or the first case and second case are related cases, fig. 13D, ¶ 0008, ¶ 0124);

wherein the docket entry indicates that references have been entered for the second patent application and a may need to be cited to a patent office (§§ 0059-0062); and

generating a viewable docket including the docket entry (fig. 14, §§ 0106, §§ 0118).

Grainger does not explicitly teach automatically creating a docket entry in a docketing database using the application manager system. However, Synder teaches automatically creating a docket entry in a docketing database using the application manager system (§§ 0018, §§ 0039). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement the step of automatically creating a docket entry because the docketing system is useful for intellectual property practitioners, such as patent attorneys, who have to keep track of several deadlines related to intellectual property cases. According to an embodiment of the present invention, the docketing system keeps track of deadlines related to one or more cases handled by one or more practitioners.

As per claim 2, Grainger teaches automatically creating an information disclosure statement including the reference data (§§ 0120).

As per claims 3-4, Grainger teaches wherein the viewable docket is a hard copy, an electronic and viewable on a screen (fig. 14).

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claim 1 argument.

Claim 6 has the same limitations as claim 2; therefore, they are rejected by the same subject matter.

As per claim 8, Grainger teaches generate a viewable docket including the docket entry (fig. 14, ¶ 0106, ¶ 0118).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/02/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Snyder does not teach automatically creating a docket entry in a docketing database wherein the docket entry indicates that references have been entered for the second patent application and may need to be cited to a patent office because Snyder's reference is directed to replacing paper-based dockets system with electronic based notifications.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner has carefully reviewed Snyder's reference, and respectfully submits that in Snyder, docket services for patent-related cases, e.g., a patent application, a patent application filed in particular country, or a patent case may actually include more than one patent application, for example, where a **Continued Prosecutions Application (CPA)** (see parg. 0062). The case data unit also stores docketing information, for example, **notifications** and docketing messages related to a **deadlines generated by docketing system** for the particular patent case (see parg. 0067), or **other patent papers (i.e. prior art references among others)** (see parg.

0065). Further, Snyder discloses docketing system automatically generates messages, reference to as “docketing messages” for the cases in response to occurrence of events related to the cases. Each messages generated by docketing system **identifies an action to be performed and identifies a date associated with the action**, and the action associated with several types of dates (see parg. 0068). In particular, Snyder discloses that base date to a date associated with the case and stored in the case data unit (e.g., if the triggering event corresponds to filing of a patent application, **the base date for an action related to IDS filings** a corresponds to the date of filing of the application (see parg. 0111). Accordingly, Examiner respectfully submits that Snyder modifies with Grainger do teach the claimed elements as set forth above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JEFFREY GAFFIN can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Debbie Le

DEBBIE M LE
Examiner
Art Unit 2168

Primary Examiner

Feb. 6, 2006